



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 2
290 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10007-1866

NOV 19 2013

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St., N.E.
Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket Nos. CP13-36-000, CP13-132-000 and PF09-8-000

Dear Ms. Bose:


The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the Rockaway Delivery Lateral Project and Northeast Connector Project (CEQ # 20130302). The Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Company (Transco) is proposing two projects to enhance reliability of National Grid's natural gas distribution system in New York City. The Rockaway Delivery Lateral Project, located in Queens, New York, would consist of a 26-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline and associated facilities, a metering and regulating facility and associated pipeline and equipment. The new pipeline would extend approximately 3.2 miles from an offshore interconnect with Transco's existing Lower New York Bay Lateral to an onshore delivery point on the Rockaway Peninsula. The Northeast Connector Project would add incremental compression to Transco's existing Compressor Station 195 in York County, Pennsylvania; Compressor Station 205 in Mercer County, New Jersey; and Compressor Station 207 in Middlesex County, New Jersey. Transco would replace three existing natural gas-fired reciprocating engines with two new electric motor drives at Compressor Station 195, and uprate existing electric-driven motors at Compressor Stations 205 and 207. These modifications would occur on lands owned by Transco within the existing compressor station sites. The modifications to the compressor stations would result in the net addition of 16,940 horsepower of compression on Transco's existing system. EPA's review was conducted in accordance with Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

EPA commends the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on its efforts to work with all the cooperating agencies during the preparation of the DEIS. While concurring with the findings of the FERC staff as enumerated in Section 5.2 of the DEIS, EPA is concerned that the General Conformity applicability analysis did not include a detailed analysis of equipment, marine engines, emissions factors and running times that were used to estimate total construction emissions. This information should be included in the final environmental impact statement.

Also, on page 4-75, second paragraph, first sentence, the word "loggerheads" should be "leatherbacks".

EPA has rated the DEIS and the proposed alternative as Lack of Objections – Adequate (LO – 1) as our review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal (see enclosed rating sheet). If you have any questions regarding this review or our comments, please contact Lingard Knutson of my staff at (212) 637-3747.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Judy Ann Mitchell".

Judy Ann Mitchell, Chief
Sustainability and Multimedia Programs Branch

Enclosure

SUMMARY OF RATING DEFINITIONS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTION

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO-Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC-Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EO-Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU-Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of environmental quality, public health or welfare. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potential unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommend for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1-Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2-Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3-Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analysis, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.